

## Interview Summary

Application No. 08/900,220 Applicant(s)

Examiner

Michael Brannock, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit 1646

Miao, N. et al.

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO pe	
(1) Michael Brannock,	(3)
(2) <u>David Halstead</u>	(4)
Date of Interview Oct 15, 2001	
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2)	applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)    Yes e)	Mo. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: <u>35 and 77</u>	
Identification of prior art discussed:	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) Nas reached. g) was not reached. h) NA.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  Examiner indicated that claims 35 and 77 were identical in scope. Applicant's attorney argued that the word "comprising" was not synonomus with the term "consisting essentially of", however he agreed, with traverse, to cancel claim 77.	
	ents which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, and ments that would render the claims allowable is available, a
i) 🔀 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate	record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMA INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MP already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FRO SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record	EP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MICHAEL BRANNOCK, PH.D. PATENT EXAMINER **ART UNIT 1646**